

REMARKS

I. Introduction

Claims 1-20 are pending on the application. In the final Office Action dated Nov. 15, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,215,857 ("Kasiviswanathan") in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,809,114 ("Solomon"). Additionally, claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kasiviswanathan in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,278,897 ("Mowery"). In this Amendment, claims 1, 11, and 14-20 have been amended. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection to the claims in light of the amendments to the claims and the following remarks.

II. The Proposed Combination of Kasiviswanathan and Solomon Does Not Render Claim 1 Unpatentable

Amended independent claim 1 recites a central office switch comprising a supplementary service processor operative to generate a query to a supplementary service database to determine whether the central office switch supports a supplementary service and to determine whether a user has access to a voicemail service. The Examiner has admitted that Kasiviswanathan fails to disclose a supplementary service database. In an attempt to cure the deficiency Solomon was cited. However, Solomon fails to disclose the element for which it was cited.

Solomon is directed to an anonymous interactive telephone system for connecting a caller to a subscriber without divulging an identity or telephone number of either the caller or the subscriber. Solomon teaches that when a caller places a telephone call to a subscriber, a database is accessed to determine how to process the telephone call. For example, based on the database, a message may be played to the caller regarding the availability of a subscriber or a caller may be permitted to leave a message for a subscriber. Solomon fails to teach a database to determine both whether a central office switch supports a supplementary service and whether a user has access to a voicemail service. Thus, Solomon necessarily fails to disclose a central office switch comprising a supplementary service processor operative to generate a query a query to a supplementary service database to determine whether the central

office switch supports a supplementary service and to determine whether a user has access to a voicemail service. For at least this reason, the proposed combination of Kasiviswanathan and Solomon necessarily does not render independent claim 1, or any claim that depends on claim 1, unpatentable. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections to the claims.

III. The Proposed Combination of Kasiviswanathan and Mowery Does Not Render Claim 1 Unpatentable

Like Kasiviswanathan and Solomon, Mowery fails to disclose a central office switch comprising a supplementary service processor operative to generate a query to a supplementary service database to determine whether the central office switch supports a supplementary service and to determine whether a user has access to a voicemail service. Mowery is directed to systems and methods for providing smart internodal transfer for subscriber access in multimode voice messaging. Mowery discloses a database to provide information regarding whether an accessed node is a home node for a subscriber, to provide password validation information, and to provide subscriber information such as subscriber mailbox information and subscriber accesses type. Mowery does not teach a database to determine both whether a central office switch supports a supplementary service and whether a user has access to a voicemail service. For at least this reason, the proposed combination of Kasiviswanathan and Mowery necessarily does not render independent claim 1, or any claim that depends on claim 1, unpatentable. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections to the claims.

IV. The Proposed Combination of Kasiviswanathan and Solomon Does Not Render Claim 11 Unpatentable

Independent claim 11 recites determining whether a central office switch supports a supplementary service based on a message sequence and a supplementary service database, and determining whether a user has access to a voicemail service based on a caller identifier and the supplementary service database. The Examiner has admitted that Kasiviswanathan fails to disclose a supplementary service database. In

an attempt to cure the deficiency Solomon was cited. However, Solomon fails to disclose the element for which it was cited.

As discussed above, Solomon fails to teach a database to determine both whether a central office switch supports a supplementary service and whether a user has access to a voicemail service. Thus, Solomon necessarily fails to disclose determining whether a central office switch supports a supplementary service based on a message sequence and a supplementary service database, and determining whether a user has access to a voicemail service based on a caller identifier and the supplementary service database. For at least this reason, the proposed combination of Kasiviswanathan and Solomon necessarily does not render independent claim 11, or any claim that depends on claim 11, unpatentable. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections to the claims.

V. The Proposed Combination of Kasiviswanathan and Mowery Does Not Render Claim 11 Unpatentable

Like Kasiviswanathan and Solomon, Mowery fails to teach a database to determine both whether a central office switch supports a supplementary service and whether a user has access to a voicemail service. Thus, Mowery necessarily fails to disclose determining whether a central office switch supports a supplementary service based on a message sequence and a supplementary service database, and determining whether a user has access to a voicemail service based on a caller identifier and the supplementary service database. For at least this reason, the proposed combination of Kasiviswanathan and Mowery necessarily does not render independent claim 11, or any claim that depends on claim 11, unpatentable. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections to the claims.

VI. The Proposed Combination of Kasiviswanathan and Solomon Does Not Render Claim 16 Unpatentable

Independent claim 16 recites generating a query to a supplementary service database in response to receiving a message sequence to determine whether the central office switch supports a supplementary service based on whether a service code

is present in the n-digit message sequence and to determine whether the user has access to the voicemail service based on a caller identifier. As discussed above, Kasiviswanathan and Solomon fail to teach a database to determine both whether a central office switch supports a supplementary service and whether a user has access to a voicemail service. Thus, Kasiviswanathan and Solomon fails to disclose generating a query to a supplementary service database in response to receiving a message sequence to determine whether the central office switch supports a supplementary service based on whether a service code is present in the n-digit message sequence and to determine whether the user has access to the voicemail service based on a caller identifier. For at least this reason, the proposed combination of Kasiviswanathan and Solomon necessarily does not render independent claim 16, or any claim that depends on claim 16, unpatentable. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections to the claims.


VII. The Proposed Combination of Kasiviswanathan and Mowery Does Not Render Claim 16 Unpatentable

Like Kasiviswanathan and Solomon, Mowery fails to teach a database to determine both whether a central office switch supports a supplementary service and whether a user has access to a voicemail service. Thus, like Kasiviswanathan and Solomon, Mowery fails to disclose generating a query to a supplementary service database in response to receiving a message sequence to determine whether the central office switch supports a supplementary service based on whether a service code is present in the n-digit message sequence and to determine whether the user has access to the voicemail service based on a caller identifier. For at least this reason, the proposed combination of Kasiviswanathan and Mowery necessarily does not render independent claim 16, or any claim that depends on claim 16, unpatentable. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections to the claims.

VIII. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks and amendments to the claims, Applicants submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration is therefore respectfully requested. If there are any questions concerning this Amendment, the Examiner is asked to phone the undersigned attorney at (312) 321-4200.

Respectfully submitted,



Scott W. Brim
Registration No. 51,500
Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200